DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 962 SP 018 856

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE The Influence of Selected Societal, University, and School Conditions on the Preparation and Practice of Teachers.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; Education Majors; *Education Work Relationship; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Recognition; Teacher Burnout; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role; *Teaching Conditions; *Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

An unresolved dilemma in teacher education is the organizational dislocation that occurs between the setting in which teachers are educated and those in which they are expected to practice. College students are conditioned to be independent and self-interested, while beginning teachers are expected to conform to and support their school system. In the university setting, students can receive misleading impressions about teaching that influence their career choice, expectations, and teaching behavior. They see the prerequisites and esteem accorded to educators, as well as the fact that society holds individual teachers largely unaccountable for students' inadequacies. When beginning teachers face the problems of daily classroom existence, sooner or later they come to the painful realization that they are not functioning as special, well-educated professionals in management, but as bureaucratic functionaries. Three conditions in the teacher educator setting shape teachers into professionals or simply job-holders: the means for evaluating pupils; the nature of the school curriculum; and the definition of the teacher's work. Teacher educators and school practitioners should share a common vision regarding these elements of their profession, so that the dichotomy between the university and school setting can be transcended. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207962

The Influence of Selected Societal, University, and School Conditions on the Preparation and Practice of Teachers

Martin Haberman, Dean
Division of Urban Outreach
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Martin Haberman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 018 856

In order to deal with the issue of creating conditions for the preparation of professionals it is necessary to examine the settings in which preparation and practice occur. Settings are not merely random or unimportant locations in which individuals act out their inevitable parts. The settings in which we live, learn and work are all part of some organizational structure and these structures influence and shape the human interactions which occur in them. As these human interactions become patterned and predictable we can legitimately refer to them as institutionalized behavior--actions deemed appropriate to varied settings such as factories, offices, churches, arenas, etc. The reason most of us are "successful" in negotiating the demands in our daily lives is that we have been sufficiently socialized to adapt our behavior as we move through a variety of these settings--sometimes in quite rapid succession. Moving through settings with ease is a function of knowing the different systems of mutual expectations which are operative. In effect, sharing common sets of mutual expectations means that we are generally able to predict the behavior of others in particular settings while others are able to anticipate our behavior with equal accuracy. Such mutual accuracy is a function of learning--of being socialized to--the values, roles, status, operating norms and even language appropriate

to each setting. While few of us can predict behavior in general or in the abstract, most of us are quite adept at successfully anticipating behavior (our own and others) in particular settings. The answers to who will do what, how and why? are known and answered in similar ways by "successful" participants in a particular setting.

As we consider teacher education it is natural to focus on the influences exerted by the content of the course-work and to try to connect such formal learnings to the tasks which will be required of the graduates in the schools. This is as it should be. It is also necessary, however, to consider educative forces beyond the formal curriculum which also impinge upon and shape future teachers. The settings in which students participate are primary examples of such shaping forces and the two most powerful settings are the university and the school in which the first-year teacher practices. What is the nature of the influence which these settings might be exerting?

The role of "student" in most college and university settings is one which places a premium on taking action in one's own behalf. As students move through their undergraduate programs they tend to become more independent. This is partially the result of the institution offering both increasing options and greater rewards for students who exercise those

options. As a result of their college careers, therefore, it is not unusual for students to believe they should exercise some measure of control over themselves and their futures. Graduates have all, in some measure, been successful at not only surviving the university structure but beating it. Increased independence and being rewarded for demonstrating initiative also lead graduates to expect that they may relate to future institutional bureacracies in the same manner and continue to receive personal and professional benefits. In addition to exerting greater control over themselves and over what the institution does for them rather than to them, university students increase their control over their own time; hourly, weekly, monthly, semester, summer, and annual schedules became their private possessions. With the exception of 12-15 hours per week of classtime (and even here students may substitute make-up assignments for cuts, arrange independent study, take competency exams, or make "creative arrangements" in lieu of class attendance), students control their own time. By graduation most students are experienced masters at managing their own time and at initiating institutional forces which interfere with such control. Students' locus of concern is themselves; their interests, their goals, their activities. It is not uncommon for parents and friends to perceive the graduates as (pre)occupied with themselves on more than a full-time basis.

These generalizations are not made in a pejorative manner; they are intended to serve as a basis for comparing the role of a successful university student with the expectations placed upon beginning teachers in typical school settings.

Beginning teachers have little control over their time; in truth, they have almost no free time over which to exercise discretion. In addition, the school bureaucracy, unlike the university setting, not only does not reward independence but punishes non-conformers as threats to the smooth functioning of the system. Keeping official attendance records is not the same order of task as passing in a term paper. The financial well-being of the school is a different "kettle of fish" from inconveniencing a professor! School teachers, unlike students, are not expected to end run bureaucratic rules but to obey them and, further, to teach others that jumping through the system's hoops in the correct order is ultimately in everyone's best interests. The conditions of the university setting which foster the practice of referring to one's self and one's needs as the most valid basis for determining one's actions are replaced by the conditions of the school organization which require referring to external conditions, rules, obligations and <u>other</u> people's needs as the basis for determining appropriate behavior. As opposed to the expectation that being self contained and introspective

is a normal condition of the student, the beginning teacher is expected to become immersed in the needs of others, fully devoted to the development of others, and completely responsive to the motives and best interests of others. The college student's goal is congruence; that is, matching actions to personal values. The beginning teacher's goal is professional behavior; doing what is in the best interests of others regardless of how one feels.

If we seriously examine the nature of the university setting and its impact on most normal students, and then compare these influences with the conditions which operate on beginners in most school settings we are led to an inevitable conclusion: there is significant organizational dislocation between the settings in which teachers are educated and in which they are expected to practice. Indeed, this is more than an organizational mismatch: it is an intentional result of systematic socialization on the part of the university which conditions students to be independent and positively selfish about pursuing their interests and an equally intentional system operating in the school which encourages beginners to conform and support the school system. The clear dilemma is that the influences being exerted on the student teacher and on the beginning

teacher, while opposite, can both be learned--but at great cost to the individual. The experience of moving from student to beginning teacher is for many a genuine trauma, not because our teacher education has failed or because the schools are inadequate, but because the lessons taught by the respective bureaucracies follow each other so swiftly with such antithetic lessons.

The argument can be made that the real difference is not between settings but between the nature of youth, who just happen to be college students, and the role of the teacher which is more compatible with individuals in later stages of life. More mature individuals are more likely to be capable of responding to the needs of others. It is likely that both of these explanations have some validity. The university setting may be an appropriate match with the stage of young adulthood focused as it is on self definition and on independence. There is clearly a very compatible interaction between the university setting which fosters attention to personal concerns and self development at a stage of life when such needs are greatest. Similarly, the school setting is a more compatible match with more mature people who are more likely to know who they are and who feel "professional" rather than "untrue to themselves" when they become immersed in the well-being and needs of others.

There is a mutually supportive interaction which occurs in schools between individuals in older adult stages of development and the role of beginning teacher.

While there is little systematically-gathered evidence to support these contentions there is much experiential data from teacher educators who have been involved in preparing older adults as well as typical college-age youth for teaching roles. This is not to claim that older people become "better" teachers than younger people. Our contention is that the disfunctional relationship between the university and the school setting holds less trauma for the more mature adult than for college youth because older persons are probably less influenced by the college setting and more likely to be at a stage of development which makes them more amenable to the demands encountered in school settings. This greater ability to fit into school settings is not necessarily related to being a "better" teacher. There are those who will simplistically conclude that if older adults are in a "giving" stage of development while younger adults are in a "taking" stage then teacher education should concentrate on recruiting the more mature. Such a conclusion is naive because it assumes that predicting human behavior can be done on the basis of one way of knowing--in this case

a psychological description of life stages. Such predictions are not reliable. The contention here is that there is an interactive effect between people and settings and that while we remain sensitive to the nature of college youth (or mature adults) we should seriously study the roles and values being modeled in our university settings. We are likely to find that what we are effectively teaching, through all aspects of daily university living, is a set of values which will increase rather than mitigate culture shock frequently felt by beginning teachers in school settings.

Thus far we have sought to describe the impact of the total university and school setting. It might be useful to pursue this comparison in greater depth since, for the future teacher, the role of the college teacher will necessarily be a role model to some degree. The usual level on which this connection is made is fairly direct: education students request education faculty to follow the methods they advocate. "What you do speaks so loudly, we can't hear what you say." Generations of education students have criticized education faculty who lecture to large classes about the values of individualization, who grade on a curve in courses such as "Methods of Teaching Creativity" and who espouse personalizing the learning process without ever learning the names of their students. Whatever the validity of these

allegations they are most familiar--even trite. Two other questions, however, can be raised which might reveal the impact of the university setting more fully. What is the day-to-day work of a teacher as demonstrated by the total college faculty? What are the influences of the university setting on the work of the education faculty?

University teaching has been variously defined as the ideal tutorial ("Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and me on the other."), as the acerbic but inspirational lecturer ("Casting artificial pearls at genuine swine."), or as the various laboratories in which students learn the particular methods of inquiry. Clearly, it is all of these and more but what might university students infer about teaching from several years in such a setting? Without giving it much direct thought it would not be farfetched if university students graduated with impressions of teaching such as the following:

> -It requires little stamina since it's done for an hour or two at a time and for only 6-12 hours per week.
>
> -It's a pleasant activity in that one can sit, stand, smoke, walk around or drink coffee.

-It is a laid-back activity. If the teacher is ill, on a trip, or at the dentist, the class can be called off or a substitute sent in.

-It requires great knowledge of the subject matter if it is to be done well.

-The teacher seeks little knowledge of the students as persons. Indeed, it is a hallmark of his fairness if he does not let personal information "get in the way."

-The teacher knows little or nothing of pedagogy, learning theory, or the nature of late adolescence and young adulthood as life stages.

-There is no person or force which can or should control the teacher's choice of content. Academic freedom is the highest value and is vested in each faculty member.

-Evaluation is the prerogative of the teacher. What is evaluated, how frequently and on what criteria is determined by the teacher.

-Grading is under the complete control of the teacher. It may be done on a comparative basis, or individually in terms of each student's progress, or against some standards.

-The teacher does not feel obligated to engage in motivational activities. He assumes the students will generate their own interest--at least it's the student's responsibility to maintain staying power if not avid interest.

-The student is responsible for having failed to learn. The teacher is never responsible for ineffective instruction. The teacher accepts no custodial responsibility whatsoever for any student condition. This includes comfort, lighting, heat, desk space, the ability to see or hear, hunger, thirst, tiredness, or getting to school.

-The teacher is not supervised.

-The teacher never deals with discipline problems. In extreme cases the campus police may be called.

-The teacher decides whether to stay after class, hold office hours or to help students with problems.

-The teacher is not directly responsible to the parents, relatives or community of the students--and certainly doesn't deal with them.

-The teacher accepts no responsibility for students' lack of prerequisites, readiness, difficulty in English, or other handicapping conditions.

These sixteen conditions do not characterize all of college teaching but they capture a sufficient degree of its essence. What is the impact on college students who experience these conditions of teaching? It may be argued that these conditions have no effect on students and certainly not on education students who are subsequently taught with better methods in their professional programs. To believe, however, that several years of instruction by perhaps 40 teachers will have no influence is a dangerous position since it may lead to questioning whether students are influenced at all by their university experience. If we believe in the value of university education we are forced to assume that the university experience has some degree of influence. How then can we limit the potential influence to the content of courses and ignore the potential influence of day-to-day interaction with the faculty? It seems most reasonable to believe that, to some degree, all university graduates including future teachers are influenced by the sixteen conditions outlined above. If this is true, it can only lead to some degree of conflict and dissatisfaction with the role of the graduate who enters an elementary or secondary school setting since every one of the university conditions (except for mastery of subject matter) is at odds with the role of the professional school teacher.

Thus far we have examined the potential influence of the total university setting and contrasted it with the total impact of lower schools on college youth and more mature adults. This led to a more specific analysis of what influences might be exerted on university students by typical college teaching practices. It might now be useful to consider the potential influence of the teacher education faculty on the future teacher.

The usual charge is that education faculty are not capable of answering the questions that students will inevitably raise. These questions relate to classroom management, handling individual differences, and bringing all pupils to minimum levels of achievement, particularly in basic skills. This charge is supported by contentions that education faculty do not have enough classroom experience, that they have been away from the classroom too long, that they are too theoretic, or that there really are no answers to the technical questions of teaching. The education faculty are, by definition, irrelevant. Rather than walk over this very well-trod road, we might be led to greater insight if we examine the conditions under which education faculty work and the impact of the university setting on them. Why do education faculty work? What is the result of their working in universities? What relationship is there between the university setting and the potential for effectiveness or irrelevance among education faculty?

What are the work goals of teacher education faculty? This can best be answered by examining why people work anywhere as well as why people work in universities. Security, the interest and usefulness of the work, salary, status, opportunities for advancement, the recognition of peers and access to particular perks are among the most typical reasons for working. In the university setting the perks are sufficiently significant so that several basic conditions of work may be accepted at less than adequate levels in order to secure special privileges. These perks include: a high level of respect from students and the public; the opportunities for service in foreign countries; the possibility of support for pursuing one's interests; opportunities for renewal such as sabbaticals or modifying the nature of one's workload; the possibility for securing the help of students and assistants; professional travel within the U.S. on a fairly regular basis; involvement in administrative positions if desired; leaves of absence for following truncated careers in private industry, government, or other fields; participation in active professional organizations; access to information and resources which are directly beneficial to the education and employment of family and friends; the opportunities for additional money and recognition via external consulting; and most of all, the ability of many to pursue this career until age seventy since

it is physically undemanding. But of all these positive general conditions of work and the specific perks of university faculty, one condition makes university teaching more creative, more open, more enjoyable than almost any other form of work. This is a built-in organizationally protected lack of accountability.

When motels collapse, military operations blow apart, plant sprays spread disease to human beings, social agencies malfunction and the interest rates at the Federal Reserve are raised when they should have been lowered, there are few if any fingers pointed at the university faculty who educated (or miseducated) these inept professionals. Admittedly, university and SCDE* administrators are the source of regular heat from members of the public and from state legislators seeking an excuse to cut budgets. But the individual education professor is so carefully wrapped in cotton wool and ensconsed in the insulated bosom of the university that almost any criticism can (and likely will) be ignored. This assertion can be tested. How many education faculty have been personally and directly affected by the long-term, scornful criticism directed at elementary and secondary schools? As a group, Education faculty have not

---

* Schools, Colleges, or Departments of Education

only emerged largely unscathed from such criticism, but have frequently been the source of the criticism! Such criticism if published is defined as "scholarly production" and in the university setting is just cause for promotion. In addition to scholarly journals, an overwhelming majority of the attacks on schools via television, newspapers, magazines, books and other media can be traced to Education faculty in universities. I am not arguing that university faculty should not be free to criticize; I am pointing out this unique dimension of not being accountable which actually encourages teacher education faculty to directly profit and benefit from attacking the work of their own graduates. This allegation is not intended to stifle criticism, but to support the contention that the outstanding attribute of teacher education is an extreme, convoluted form of non-accountability. Teacher education faculty neither perceive themselves, nor are they perceived by others, as responsible for the performance of their institution's graduates. As we analyze the university-based teacher educator as a worker, therefore, s/he is in an "ideal" position; any blame or failure will largely be attributed to inadequacies in the individual student, or to conditions in the schools where the beginner practices. The total university may be subjected to occasional barbs but these can usually be deflected; after all, universities did not shape

the personalities of those who enter teacher education, nor do they have any voice in the operation of the schools in which graduates are placed. In such a situation whatever criticism is leveled at the university or at the SCDE's, only a few harmless drops will ever trickle onto individual teacher educators.

One result of this condition of non-accountability is that individual faculty are neither rewarded for being effective teacher educators nor punished for being ineffective. Driven by traditional criteria (i.e., university teaching, research, and service) the individual faculty member is encouraged to be institutionally irrelevant to the subsequent practices of the students in school settings. While it is small comfort, we should recognize that this situation pertains, to some degree, in law, business, nursing, social work and in all the other professional schools which are predicated upon university training.

Looking at the situation conversely we might frame the task of changing this condition as: What would have to happen in the SCDE's for each faculty member to respond to the quality of the graduate's performance? The following are some of the necessary conditions of the university setting for preparing professionals in a more accountable manner:

1. University-based teacher educators would have to perceive of themselves as having some influence on the recruitment and admission of students into teacher education programs.
2. University-based teacher educators would have to perceive of themselves as part of a cohesive group of trainers with a reasonable opportunity for significant impact on the total orientation to teaching held by their students.
3. University-based teacher educators would have to perceive of themselves as having some influence on the conditions which pertain to students in professional laboratory experiences and in their first year of actual teaching.
4. University-based teacher educators would have to perceive of themselves as somehow involved in determining the general/liberal studies programs which account for 2/3 to 3/4 of the future teacher's knowledge base.
5. University-based teacher educators would have to be evaluated by "professionalized criteria" for their merit and promotion. Such criteria would be tailored to the activities in the four previous functions and not to criteria such as grant getting, serving on

important university committees or being published in refereed journals.

6. University-based teacher educators would need to operate in program structures outside of the traditional college departments which now structure SCDE's and which lead to narrow forms of licensure and even narrower forms of self definition. Traditional university departments prevent the preparation of the type of teachers who are really needed: e.g., those who can mainstream, those who can teach in multicultural schools, and most of all, those who have an interdisciplinary, problem-centered approach to teaching and learning on all school levels.
7. University-based teacher educators need Education Deans to represent teacher education interests--individuals who can be successful advocates of these necessary conditions upward--and not merely the messengers of the university-wide administration downward.
8. University-based teacher educators need a common philosophical base which not only unites the SCDE but which fosters identification with classroom teachers and demonstrates a strong desire for membership in the same profession rather than in a different or competing one. The present condition supports a three-caste,

disorganized profession comprised of university administrators (Education Deans), college faculty (in various sub-specialty organizations), and schoolteachers.

There are undoubtedly other conditions which undergird professional education and which further analysis will reveal. The essence of the idea being proposed here is that viewing education faculty (or their graduates) as individuals will lead to only limited understanding of their present behavior and to minimal success at predicting their future behavior. If, however, we are willing to expand our analysis to include how faculty and students interact with their environments we will soon come to see how the university setting impinges upon, influences, and even shapes the teacher education faculty and their students.

Thus far we have dealt with selected factors in the university setting--conditions which affect and to some degree control, the behavior of teacher educators. This analysis leads us to define the actions of administrators, faculty and students as not simply irrelevant or applicable to subsequent school practice, but as a normal and predictable set of responses to the conditions of life in the American university. It might now be useful to examine some of the typical conditions of life in school settings. These are the influences exerted on graduates and beginners which,

apart from the particular personalities of these individuals, will shape and control their behavior during the process of induction and thereafter.

A fairly extensive research literature cites the problems of beginners as classroom management, dealing with individual differences, bringing all students to minimum achievement levels, coping with incessant interruptions, unrealistic clerical demands, and dealing with the full range of handicapping conditions encountered in typical classrooms. Are these unreasonable problems inflicted on beginners or are they to be anticipated? It might well be argued that what the researchers (and the beginners they interview) assume to be problems which interfere with teaching are actually the work of the teacher. Is the work of the teacher to "teach" in some unimpeded but effective manner and then regard the bored, the unready, or the resistant as problems? What would happen to dentists who claimed they could not fill cavities because decay is frequently found in difficult to reach teeth, in mouths that won't easily stay open, in bodies that neglect to pay their bills? Are these problems (i.e., events which should not be expected to occur) or are they the common expectations of the job? This is not to argue that beginners have no actual problems; on the contrary, they confront enormous tasks. It may be, however,

that the essence of their problems derives from the fact that they do not accept a role which they did not anticipate in an organization they do not understand. This role, which seems to me to undergird most of the real and thus far unstudied dissatisfactions of beginners, is based on conditions in the setting which are typical in today's schools. These conditions create a day-to-day role for the beginner that the beginner resists without really knowing why. There is a pervasive feeling of being helpless, feeling used, like a cog in a machine. As the beginner gains experience, classroom discipline becomes manageable, (at least some) individual differences are accounted for and skills for cutting down on interruptions and reports are mastered. Yet, the vague overall malaise seems to linger on or to increase. What is it that makes so many beginners unhappy to the point of disillusionment? It is, I believe, their growing realization--unclarified in their own minds--that they are not functioning as well educated professionals should function at all. While it is rarely stated in this way, beginners painfully come to appreciate that they are working at jobs--jobs very similar to others in profit and non-profit organizations. Somehow they expected to be special and to have some measure of self-determination--even independence--in their teaching practice. The realization that they are less like management and more like labor is a hard (and for many an impossible) self definition.

One explanation for the beginner's inability to identify this effect is that it comes in the form of an ambience--an all-encompassing condition that engulfs them in somewhat the same manner as an environmental change in the atmosphere.

I have selected three factors in the setting which I believe mold beginners in this quite subtle but all-encompassing way. These conditions lead beginners from holding high expectations (i.e., "Teaching may very well be a profession.") to questioning whether teaching is even for them. ("There must be a better job!") These critical conditions of the setting relate to the means for evaluating pupils, the nature of the school curriculum, and the definition of the teacher's work. Taken together, these conditions can shape beginners into professionals or job holders.

Evaluation, which refers to making judgments about the quality of pupils' work, goes on all the time. Most teachers become fairly expert at a variety of informal and formal means of evaluation. Unfortunately, in today's schools evaluation has been made synonomous with assessment, which in turn has become further narrowed to mean testing--and testing is most frequently translated to mean norm referenced achievement and aptitude testing. The misuse of norm referenced testing has been well known for sometime; nevertheless, it is still in widespread and dominant use. (It is noteworthy that

in April, 1981 even the International Reading Association, whose membership has profited greatly from the remarkable proliferation of norm referenced standardized tests, adapted a motion at its annual meeting which stated in unequivocal terms that grade equivalent scores do not tell how well students will be able to read and that such scores should not be used to compare the achievement of students, groups, or schools.) Unfortunately, the public has been taught to demand norm referenced scores and almost all schools use them. As a result, the work of the teacher in most schools is, in effect, directed toward success on such tests. This creates a condition whereby the school setting exercises a very strong set of controls over the teacher's behavior. The teacher is transformed into a technical assistant "helping" pupils prepare for mastering content that has been almost completely predetermined by testmakers. While most student teachers have been fairly well prepared to teach reading and other subjects, they have not been prepared to accept the reality that their teaching will be so completely directed toward the particular tests adopted in their schools. The teacher's recognition of this behavioral shaping is frequently an unconscious feeling, sometimes a subtle awareness, but in almost all cases it is manifested in a strong sense of being used. In reality, a great share of the teacher's work

is as a test tutor. When the beginning teachers' consciousness is raised regarding how norm referenced tests control what supervisors, parents, colleagues, and even pupils think of their work, they begin to feel dominated and abused by this condition.

There is no intention to discuss the validity or reliability of norm referenced testing here. Neither do I wish to make any analysis of how such tests are (mis)used. The point here is that there are several school curricula: what is stated in the curriculum guides; what the teachers actually teach; what the pupils really learn; and what is tested for. And of all these curricula, the curriculum that is tested for inevitably dominates the day-to-day work of the teacher.

This leads to a second condition of the school setting which strongly affects the induction of beginning teachers. Basic skills which can be clearly assessed have achieved a curricular dominance. The arts and humanities; scientific studies which require understanding methods of problem solving and various modes of inquiry; and any subject matters taught in ways which emphasize learning principals rather than information, have all been downgraded. The "basic skills," usually defined as the 3 R's in elementary school and as job-related skills in secondary school, have

achieved a position of paramount importance. The mind set of the public and those in the school is to guarantee minimum standards for all rather than to permit differences to accentuate during the process of schooling. This narrowing down of the curriculum is not the condition which beginners were prepared for. There are several controls which such a restricted curriculum places on beginners: given a choice of which level of pupil to provide extra help, the beginning teacher is organizationally shaped to concentrate on pupils who must be brought up to grade level; given a choice of type of content to emphasize, the beginning teacher is organizationally guided to those forms of learning which are readily assessable; given a range of individuals with whom to work, the beginning teacher will resist accepting responsibility for the disadvantaged or those with handicapping conditions. Is is not reasonable to expect that if teachers are judged on the basis of pupils' basic skills that they will seek conditions and pupils which they believe make the teaching of such skills easier? In response to this condition (i.e., a narrow skills-oriented curriculum), it is not difficult to predict or to understand teachers' demands for smaller classes, homogenous groupings, more special teachers, more counselors, school psychologists, social workers and health officers. The usual explanation of these demands is that teachers are

simply seeking easier workloads. My contention may be less simple but more logical and more psychological. Why should not teachers seek to structure a setting which is more likely to lead to success--or at least to less failure?

Thus far the impact of norm-referenced testing and a narrow school curriculum have been cited as conditions of the setting which impinge on beginning teachers. Among other effects, these conditions make beginners realize that their general/liberal studies and their professional education may be inappropriate; that they are over-educated and irrelevant at the same time. But there is a third condition of the setting which emerges from the same social forces which have substituted norm-referenced testing for pupil evaluation and basic skills for a broad curriculum of general education. This is the condition of deprofessionalization which results from the widespread use of packaged, teacher-proof materials.

The range of curriculum packages in practice is very broad: teacher's manuals now provide step-by-step scenarios of what the teacher should say and write on the blackboard and in what order; textbooks tell the teacher what questions to ask and in what order; packages of science and social studies materials supposedly require nothing of the teacher but the ability to read and to follow directions; television instruction, films, or slide shows lead the

teacher by the hand through the process of instruction. While most teachers criticize university teacher educators for not being sufficiently specific in their advice, they are even more hostile to using these systems, packages, guided kits, or mediated programs which seek to control their every action. And computerized instruction promises to accentuate this trend, making the only role remaining for the teacher the announcement of when the room will be open for access to the terminals. Again, this condition of the setting is not obvious to every beginner or experienced teacher. They are not all highly conscious of how they are being controlled. What they almost all feel, however, is a general resentment. More than ever, the American teacher is starting to feel resonance, empathy, and sympathy for the workers who first put their sabots into the machinery.

The point of all this--the three conditions in the school setting--is that beginners (and experienced teachers) may not really face a situation in which their biggest problems are discipline, low pay, large classes, or handicapped students; while important, these are not the primary cause of their consternation. Teachers are simply catching up to a truth which is basic to all people who work in most industries, social organizations and government agencies: that to a degree much greater than we care to admit, we are bureaucratic functionaries. The sensitive, well-educated

teacher may sense these controls being exerted by the setting in the first three months; others may be in their eighth or tenth year before they sense themselves to be technical rather than professional help. Older teachers may have taken longer to reach this awareness because the engineering model which now dominates the school setting is of fairly recent vintage.

An engineering model is one in which pupils are defined as inputs and their learning as outputs, and in which the teacher is a skilled technician capable of transforming the raw inputs into the refined products. In short, what teachers now dislike about teaching is very similar to what most people dislike about most jobs--control over their behavior and the recognition that they are readily replaceable. This last does not refer to the oversupply of teachers. "Ready replacement" refers to the fact that once a position has been made into a technical set of skills, then those who perform these jobs become of little or no importance. Teachers can be replaced--not because there are too many of them--but because skills tutors and people who can follow directions in teachers' manuals can replace each other with little effect on input or output. This depersonalization of teaching is a direct result of the conditions in the school setting which have deprofessionalized the day-to-day work of the teacher.

These conditions of the school setting have not "simply happened." They have been systematically arrived at by a broad range of constituencies who were (and are) unhappy about some aspect of schooling. Critics of schools have never been in short supply. The convergence of solutions, however, has been to develop teacher-proof curriculum packages.

This analysis of conditions in the school setting not only accounts for the trauma of the beginning teacher, but for the increasing incidence of burn-out among the more experienced. As work requires less thinking and planning, as it carries less accountability, and as it becomes more routinized it takes on the attributes of any technical piece-work--something one does over and over until a standardized set of behaviors is all that is required.

There are clear solutions to all of these conditions in the setting. Many forms of evaluation should replace the present overdependence on norm-referenced tests. School curriculum should be reconceptualized so that basic skills are once again viewed as the means rather than ends of education. If these conditions are realized, the work of the teacher will once again be broadened into professional activities since the teacher will be required to make important decisions about the objectives of learning and not merely the techniques of tutoring.

These conditions will not be easy to achieve. There seems to be widespread public concensus that schooling is best when it is most narrow--when the goals of schooling are confined to learning basic skills and things directly connected to preparation for specific jobs. Elementary and secondary education is thus defined as a personal good--something that individuals acquire in order to get ahead, improve themselves and become successful. In this model schooling leads to training successful people who will pay taxes and not break the law. The underlying assumption is that if everyone pursues their economic self interest--with some degree of success--the common good (whatever that may be) will automatically be taken care of. This is a resurrection of economic liberalism applied to education and society. This is the current conception of schooling held by many (perhaps most) Americans. It explains why many now advocate that only those with children should pay school taxes and why schools should be set up as competing businesses which permit the parents to function as customers who should be able to select the manufacturer (i.e., the school) of their choice.

Education as a personal good is not merely a popular idea: it has become a condition of the larger societal setting. It facilitates related conditions prevalent in school settings--

conditions which make the teacher a technical worker rather than a professional whose actions are governed by principles as well as by techniques. The solution to the problems in university and school settings discussed in this analysis requires that we first deal with the blatant societal misconception regarding the purposes of schooling in America. It is incumbent upon university teacher educators and school practitioners to reach some general agreements regarding the purposes of schooling. Once that occurs the conditions in the school setting which we have described as exerting a debilitating force on teacher behavior would be ameliorated. While there are things that can be altered in the university and school settings which would undoubtedly create more professional conditions of preparation and practice, we should not lose sight of this overarching societal condition. If education faculty in SCDE's and school practitioners actually shared a common vision regarding their purposes, that set of common agreements might transcend (even overcome) conditions in the university or school settings we have discussed. Indeed, a common professional credo would create new forms of university/school curricula with new forms of impact on beginning and experienced teachers. Dialogue between teacher educators and teachers should be intense and continuous. I believe these groups can agree on broader purposes for

schooling than is currently in vogue. They can also agree to support each other in efforts to change selected conditions in their respective settings. School teachers should be involved in helping teacher education faculty to realize the eight situational factors proposed for university settings earlier. Similarly, university faculty should be an active constituency helping teachers to broaden school programs beyond basic skills, to redefine evaluation beyond norm-referenced testing and to putting curriculum decision making back into the realm of the teacher's work.

I realize that I have proposed changing real factors in the settings (financial, legal, and organizational constraints) by using the power of ideas or revised ways of thinking. To many this will appear naive. My assumption, however, is that a prerequisite for a profession is a commonly held ethic. There will, therefore, be some inevitable effects on all the present settings if those who participate in implementing this shared ethic are involved in shaping it. The "impossible" goals of changing university and school settings will be altered as a natural consequence of teachers and teacher educators clarifying common values and purposes.